

**Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
June 26, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting on June 26, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary of the discussion for information purposes for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting. The Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

### **Action Items – May 22, 2001 Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting**

A summary of the May 22, 2001 Cultural Resources Work Group meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from the May 22, 2001 Cultural Resources Work Group meeting as follows:

- |                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| <b>Action Item #C12:</b> | Provide information on Native American community opportunities for involvement and paid participation.  |
| Status:                  | Information regarding Native American community employment opportunities during cultural resources studies is on tonight's agenda.  |
| <b>Action Item #C13:</b> | Presentation regarding State Historic Preservation Office roles and responsibilities.   |
| Status:                  | Steve Heipel suggested that the presentation would be more effective if given by a SHPO representative and that it may be worth postponing the presentation until SHPO elects to get involved in the relicensing process. The Cultural Resources Work Group agreed to continue this discussion at the next meeting. |
| <b>Action Item #C14:</b> | Distribute to the Cultural Resources Work Group revised draft Issue Sheets for review at the next meeting.  |
| Status:                  | Draft Issue Sheets will be distributed to the Cultural Resources Work Group as part of the Resource Goals discussion on tonight's agenda.   |
| <b>Action Item #C15:</b> | Update from Early Studies Task Force.   |
| Status:                  | An update of the Early Studies Task Force is on tonight's agenda.   |

### **Carryover Action Items**

- |                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Action Item #C5:</b> | DWR to determine what reports have been done and what is incomplete regarding existing collections.  |
| Status:                 | Action is on going.  |
| <b>Action Item #C7:</b> | Initiate preliminary discussions with Bob Thorne regarding strategies for in-place protection of cultural sites.   |
| Status:                 | Mark Selverston of the consulting team reported that a scope of work for Bob Thorne was being finalized that includes a visit to selected sites in the fluctuation zone sometime in late August or September to coincide with the anticipated lowest lake level. |

### **Comments on Area of Potential Effects (APE)**

At the May Cultural Resources Work Group meeting, participants adopted the current FERC boundary as the proposed APE for developing cultural resources studies and agreed to review that

boundary and provide recommended changes at the June Cultural Resources Work Group meeting.

Steve Heipel of the consulting team pointed out that the Cultural Resources Work Group agreement as well as FERC and SHPO acceptance of the APE is critical to complying with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. He emphasized that it is possible to change the project APE, but that evidence of a direct or indirect impact from the project would be required. Steve also mentioned that refining the APE is an iterative process based on attaining new information about potential sites. He stressed that the FERC boundary is only the beginning of this process. Cultural Resources Work Group participants provided the following recommendations regarding the APE:

Eric Ritter, representing the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) suggested the following changes:

- One mile beyond existing boundary up primary forks of the Feather River within the drainage
- One-half mile beyond the existing boundary up secondary streams
- One-quarter mile beyond the existing boundary up tertiary streams
- All defined recreation areas
- If no spot survey, sensitivity study or modeling to rule out areas, extend boundary one-half mile all around
- Low flow area between diversion pool and northeast corner of wildlife area (to outlet)
- Below dam – buffer expanded to consider development (urban or other) that occurred as consequence of project development
- Transmission lines associated with project
- Banks of the Feather River to the confluence with the Sacramento River
- Western Pacific Railroad relocation site (Table Mountain)

Other participants suggested the following:

- Chinese cultural center (potential enhancement)
- Hamilton Cemetery
- Beckwourth Trail
- Brian Beavers' house up North Fork Feather River
- Big Bald Rock, Little Bald Rock, Bald Rock Dome
- Numerous statues throughout area
- Indian Cemetery in downtown Oroville

The Cultural Resources Work Group discussed the need to maintain flexibility in developing the APE within the context of potential early studies. Some participants expressed concern that early studies had the potential to set the FERC boundary as the APE for future studies. Steve Heipel responded that the contemplated early studies are in the fluctuation zone and are therefore in the existing FERC boundary. Additionally, prior to developing study plans, the APE developed by the Cultural Resources Work Group will be evaluated to determine if a change in the boundary is necessary. He added that there is currently not enough information to draw a precise line and the Cultural Resources Work Group would need to identify cultural resources affected by project operations outside the existing FERC boundary to justify changing the APE.

Ted Alvarez of the Department of Water Resources reminded the Cultural Resource Work Group that they had agreed to provide justification for their suggested changes to the existing boundary. He asked the consulting team to confer with participants who suggested specific changes to get additional information supporting their recommendations.

### **Work Opportunities**

At the May Cultural Resources Work Group meeting, participants discussed potential employment opportunities associated with the cultural resources studies to be conducted during the relicensing

effort. The consulting team was tasked with developing job descriptions for tribal members. A handout describing job opportunities associated with the relicensing effort was distributed to the Cultural Resources Work Group and is appended to this summary as Attachment 4.

The consulting team described field and research jobs that may be available to tribal members. They anticipate a wide variety of work that should satisfy a range of interests and identified their secondary goal to provide a foundation of training and knowledge that could spark a long-term interest and potential future employment in archaeology. They added that since the study plans had yet to be developed, they could not accurately assess how many jobs or exactly which type might be available.

Dale Hoffman-Floerke asked tribal representatives to share the employment handout with as many individuals as possible through whatever method they felt appropriate and determine the level of interest in their communities for each job type. Tribal representatives were asked to provide Dale with information regarding tribal interest by July 19, 2001. The consulting team will then prepare training workshops for each job classification. Dale added that the first workshops would be half-day overviews, followed by additional detailed training focusing on each job.

Dale told the participants that the Mooretown Tribe had volunteered to be the employment coordinator with authority to interview and hire workers, provide human resources support, and organize work crews. Funding would be provided by DWR through an existing Sonoma State University contract. Shirley Prusia from Mooretown Rancheria explained that they had discussed this arrangement with the other tribes and had their support.

One participant asked if there would be non-Native American employment opportunities. Dale responded that DWR would consider this option.

### **Geographic Information Systems**

John Lance of the Department of Water Resources provided the Cultural Resources Work Group with an overview of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and application to the relicensing process. John defined GIS as a system of computer software, hardware, data and personnel to help manipulate, analyze and present information that is tied to a spatial (geographic) location. He emphasized that GIS is not a static mapping system, although maps are often a product of GIS. He added that GIS provides a method to visualize, manipulate, analyze and display spatial data to produce a variety of end products including "smart maps" that link database information to a map.

John provided the Cultural Resources Work Group with a status report on the GIS database being prepared by DWR for the relicensing effort. He showed the Cultural Resources Work Group various layers of data that had been input into the GIS to date and discussed various other data sets that could be added. John explained that almost any type of information could be integrated into the GIS. This could include information regarding pre-reservoir river channels and other bathymetric data, locations of communities inundated by the construction of the dam, and photographs. He added that a publicly accessible interactive kiosk could be developed where a user could view various types of information simply by selecting a point on the screen.

### **Task Force Report – Early Studies**

At the May Cultural Resources Work Group meeting, participants initiated a Fluctuation Zone Task Force to develop early study recommendations that may be initiated prior to the completion of the full set of study plans. These studies would deal specifically with project impacts within the reservoir fluctuation zone and take advantage of anticipated low water levels this year. The Cultural Resources Work Group requested that the Fluctuation Zone Task Force review information prepared by the consultant team and report back to the Cultural Resources Work Group at their June meeting.

Dale Hoffman-Floerke reported that the Fluctuation Zone Task Force met and discussed a variety of Cultural Resources Work Group issues including the geographic scope of early studies within the fluctuation zone. DWR estimates that the level of Oroville reservoir will fall to about 720 feet by this fall. The Fluctuation Zone Task Force determined that the early studies should focus on tasks that can be carried out in the zone between the high and estimated low reservoir levels. The Fluctuation Zone Task Force requested that the consultant team prepare a scope of work for the early studies that would include information needs and implementation methods. Dale emphasized that the Fluctuation Zone Task Force and Cultural Resources Work Group will need to come to resolution quickly on the studies since reservoir levels are falling quickly.

The next meeting of the Task Force is July 19, 2001, at 10 a.m. at Mooretown Rancheria.

### **Meeting Calendar**

The Facilitator provided the Cultural Resources Work Group with a calendar containing the dates and times of all Work Group and Plenary Group meetings set through February 2002. The calendar is appended to this summary as Attachment 5. She added that the Engineering and Operations Work Group had already made some proposed changes to their meeting schedule not reflected on the calendar but that these changes would be posted on the relicensing web site once confirmed.

### **Issue Sheet Development – Resource Goals**

The Facilitator shared a draft graphic to remind the Cultural Resources Work Group of where we are in the process. The graphic indicated how the development of Issue Statements and Issue Sheets fit into the process of study plan development. The Facilitator provided a brief overview of the elements of an Issue Sheet and how Issue Sheet development fit with other Work Group activities such as scoping document preparation and study plan development. She reminded participants that the Issue Sheets are working documents for the Cultural Resources Work Group to use while crafting study plans. The more clearly the Issue sheets reflect the Cultural Resources Work Group's collective intent with regard to each Issue Statement, the more precise and focused the Study Plans can be.

The Cultural Resources Work Group received revised draft Issue Sheets developed by the consulting team that included comments made by the participants at the May Cultural Resources Work Group meeting. The revisions focused on draft descriptions of the geographic scope and resource goals and included Issues Addressed for each Issue Statement. As a result of discussions in other Work Groups and in an effort to provide clarity for participants while developing the study plans, the Issue Sheets also included a draft of each Issue Statement posed as a question.

- Cultural Resources Work Group participants discussed the option of stating each Issue Statement as either a statement or question. Some participants felt that formatting the Issue Statement as a question helped with developing other sections of the Issue Sheet but there was some concern that the Plenary Group should make the determination regarding the Issue Statements format for the Scoping Document. The Facilitator responded that the Cultural Resources Work Group was not being asked to pre-empt the Plenary Group, but was provided the optional question format simply so they could utilize whichever format helped them develop more clearly defined Issue Sheets.
- Craig Jones of the State Water Contractors voice concerned regarding Issue Sheet development in general and stressed that study plans need to be focused to address impacts of the project operations and facilities. Steve Nachtman of the Consulting Team confirmed that FERC looks for nexus to the project when considering study plans. The Cultural Resources Work Group considered whether a preface to the Issue Sheets should include a statement that the studies being considered conform to FERC requirements (i.e. studies have a nexus to the

project). The participants agreed that the overall goal of conforming to FERC requirements should guide the development of study plans related to cultural resources.

The Cultural Resources Work Group reviewed each revised Draft Issue Sheet. The revised Issue Sheets with Cultural Resources Work Group comments is appended to this summary as Attachment 6.

- For Issue Sheet CR 2, the Cultural Resources Work Group discussed the definition of a significant cultural resource. The Cultural Resources Work Group agreed that not every artifact or site would prove to be significant or require study but the process should determine this, and the system should remain flexible to allow the Cultural Resources Work Group to make the final decision. Kevin McCormick of the U.S. Forest Service reminded the participants that the federal regulations already included methods for determining significance and should be used in this process.

### **Homework**

The consultants and DWR will revise the Issue Sheets to reflect their view on existing information and information needs. The Cultural Resources Work Group participants also agreed to develop their recommendations for existing information and information needs for discussion at their next meeting.

### **Next Meeting**

The Cultural Resources Work Group agreed to meet again:

Date: Tuesday, July 24, 2001  
Time: 5 to 9 p.m.  
Location: Mooretown Rancheria

The Cultural Resource Work Group meeting adjourned at 9 p.m.

### **Agreements Made**

1. The Cultural Resources Work Group agreed to continue the discussion of the State Historic Preservation Office to the next meeting.
2. The Cultural Resources Work Group participants agreed to develop recommendations for existing information and information needs to include in the Issue Sheets at their next meeting.
3. The Cultural Resources Work Group agreed to meet again on July 24, 2001 from 5 to 9 p.m. at the Mooretown Rancheria.

### **Action Items**

The following list of action items identified by the Cultural Resources Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and due date.

**Action Item #C16:** Share employment information with members of tribal communities. Report response (number of individuals and specific interests) back to Dale Hoffman-Floerke.

**Responsible:** Tribal Representatives

**Due Date:** July 19, 2001

**Action Item #C17:** Develop one-half day training session/workshops to provide an overview of Cultural Resource employment opportunities to interested tribal community members.

**Responsible:** Consulting staff/DWR

**Due Date:** Pending interest input from Tribal Representatives.

**Action Item #C18:** Confer with Cultural Resources Work Group participants who provided APE recommendations to determine justification for suggested changes to the existing FERC boundary/APE.

**Responsible:** Consulting staff

**Due Date:** July 24, 2001

**Action Item #C19:** Revise Issue Sheets to include existing information and information needs for discussion at the next Cultural Resources Work Group meeting.

**Responsible:** Consulting staff/DWR

**Due Date:** July 24, 2001

**Action Item #C20:** Provide scope for information needs and implementation methods relative to early studies for review by next Early Studies Task Force meeting.

**Responsible:** Consulting Team/DWR

**Due Date:** July 19, 2001

**Carryover Action Item:**

**Action Item #C13:** Presentation regarding State Historic Preservation Office roles and responsibilities.

**Responsible:** DWR/SHPO

**Due Date:** July 24, 2001